UTAH HEALTH CARE MALPRACTICE ACT AMENDMENTS
2018 GENERAL SESSION
STATE OF UTAH
Chief Sponsor: Daniel Hemmert
House Sponsor:
LONG TITLE
General Description:
This bill amends provisions of the Utah Health Care Malpractice Act.
Highlighted Provisions:
This bill:
<ul> <li>requires a health care provider that signs an affidavit of merit to provide an</li> </ul>
explanation of the health care provider's qualifications to provide the information in
the affidavit of merit;
<ul> <li>requires the Division of Occupational and Professional Licensing to request and</li> </ul>
compile certain information related to a request for a medical liability pre-litigation
panel review;
<ul> <li>amends the elements of a nonplaintiff cause of action; and</li> </ul>
<ul><li>makes technical changes.</li></ul>
Money Appropriated in this Bill:
None
Other Special Clauses:
None
<b>Utah Code Sections Affected:</b>
AMENDS:
78B-3-423, as enacted by Laws of Utah 2010, Chapter 97
<b>78B-3-426</b> , as enacted by Laws of Utah 2016, Chapter 257



S.B. 223 02-22-18 2:24 PM

28	
29	Be it enacted by the Legislature of the state of Utah:
30	Section 1. Section 78B-3-423 is amended to read:
31	78B-3-423. Affidavit of merit.
32	(1) (a) [Before] For a cause of action that arises on or after July 1, 2010, before a
33	claimant may receive a certificate of compliance under Sections 78B-3-416 and 78B-3-418, a
34	claimant shall file an affidavit of merit under this section[:].
35	(b) The claimant shall file an affidavit of merit:
36	(i) within 60 days [of the date of the panel's] after the day on which the pre-litigation
37	panel issues an opinion, if the claimant receives a finding from the pre-litigation panel in
38	accordance with Section 78B-3-418 of non-meritorious for either:
39	(A) the claim of breach of applicable standard of care; or
40	(B) that the breach of care was the proximate cause of injury;
41	(ii) within 60 days [of the expiration of] after the day on which the time limit in
42	Subsection 78B-3-416(3)(b)(ii) expires, if a pre-litigation hearing is not held within the time
43	limits under Subsection 78B-3-416(3)(b)(ii); or
44	(iii) within 30 days [of the division's] after the day on which the division makes a
45	determination under Subsection 78B-3-416(3)(d)(ii)(B), if the division makes a determination
46	under Subsection 78B-3-416(3)(d)(ii)(B).
47	[(b)] (c) A claimant who is required to file an affidavit of merit under Subsection (1)(a)
48	shall:
49	(i) file the affidavit of merit with the division; and
50	(ii) serve each defendant with the affidavit of merit in accordance with Subsection
51	78B-3-412(3).
52	(2) The affidavit of merit shall:
53	(a) be executed by the claimant's attorney or the claimant if the claimant is proceeding
54	pro se, stating that the affiant has consulted with and reviewed the facts of the case with a
55	health care provider who has determined after a review of the medical record and other relevant
56	material involved in the particular action that there is a reasonable and meritorious cause for
57	the filing of a medical liability action; and
58	(b) include an affidavit signed by a health care provider who meets the requirements of

02-22-18 2:24 PM S.B. 223

59	Subsection [(3), which states that in the health care provider's opinion] (4):
60	(i) stating that in the health care provider's opinion, there are reasonable grounds to
61	believe that the applicable standard of care was breached;
62	(ii) stating that in the health care provider's opinion, the breach was a proximate cause
63	of the injury claimed in the notice of intent to commence action; [and]
64	(iii) stating the reasons for the health care provider's opinion[-]; and
65	(iv) including a detailed explanation of the health care provider's qualifications to make
66	the statements described in Subsections (2)(b)(i) through (iii).
67	[(c)] (3) The statement required in Subsection (2)(b)(i) shall be waived if the claimant
68	received an opinion that there was a breach of the applicable standard of care under Subsection
69	78B-3-418(2)(a)(i).
70	[(3)] (4) A health care provider who signs [the] an affidavit [of merit] under Subsection
71	(2) <u>(b)</u> shall:
72	(a) if none of the respondents is a physician [licensed under Title 58, Chapter 67, Utah
73	Medical Practice Act,] or an osteopathic physician [licensed under Title 58, Chapter 68, Utah
74	Osteopathic Medical Practice Act], hold a current unrestricted license issued by the appropriate
75	licensing authority of Utah or another state in the same [specialty]:
76	(i) (A) health care profession as the respondents; or [of the same]
77	(B) class of license as the respondents; [or] and
78	(ii) specialty as the respondents; or
79	(b) if at least one of the respondents is a physician [licensed under Title 58, Chapter 67
80	Utah Medical Practice Act,] or an osteopathic physician [licensed under Title 58, Chapter 68,
81	Utah Osteopathic Medical Practice Act], hold a current unrestricted license issued by the
82	appropriate licensing authority of Utah or another state to practice medicine in all its branches.
83	[(4)] (5) A claimant's attorney or claimant may obtain up to a 60-day extension to file
84	the affidavit of merit if:
85	(a) the claimant or the claimant's attorney submits a signed affidavit for extension with
86	notice to the division attesting to the fact that the claimant is unable to submit an affidavit of
87	merit as required by this section because:
88	(i) a statute of limitations would impair the action; and
89	(ii) the affidavit of merit could not be obtained before the expiration of the statute of

S.B. 223 02-22-18 2:24 PM

limitations;	and
minitations,	uma

(b) the claimant or claimant's attorney submits the affidavit for extension to each named respondent in accordance with Subsection 78B-3-412(3) no later than 60 days after the date specified in Subsection [(1)(a)(i)] (1)(b)(i).

- [(5)] (6) (a) A claimant or claimant's attorney who submits allegations in an affidavit of merit that are found to be without reasonable cause and untrue, based on information available to the plaintiff at the time the affidavit was submitted to the division, is liable to the defendant for the payment of reasonable expenses and reasonable attorney fees actually incurred by the defendant or the defendant's insurer.
- (b) An affidavit of merit is not admissible, and cannot be used for any purpose, in a subsequent lawsuit based on the claim that is the subject of the affidavit, except for the purpose of establishing the right to recovery under Subsection [(5)] (6)(c).
- (c) A court, or arbitrator under Section 78B-3-421, may award costs and attorney fees under Subsection [(5)] (6)(a) if the defendant files a motion for costs and attorney fees within 60 days of the judgment or dismissal of the action in favor of the defendant. The person making a motion for attorney fees and costs may depose and examine the health care provider who prepared the affidavit of merit under Subsection (2)(b).
- [(6)] (7) If a claimant or the claimant's attorney does not file an affidavit of merit as required by this section, the division may not issue a certificate of compliance for the claimant and the malpractice action shall be dismissed by the court.
- [(7)] (8) [This section applies to a cause of action that arises on or after July 1, 2010.]

  For each request for pre-litigation panel review under Subsection 78B-3-416(2)(b), the division shall compile the following information:
  - (a) whether the cause of action arose on or after July 1, 2010;
  - (b) the number of respondents named in the request; and
  - (c) for each respondent named in the request:
- (i) the respondent's license class;
- (ii) if the respondent has a professional specialty, the respondent's professional specialty;
- 119 <u>(iii)</u> if the division does not issue a certificate of compliance, the reason a certificate
  120 was not issued, including whether:

02-22-18 2:24 PM S.B. 223

121	(A) the request was denied due to lack of jurisdiction by the division;
122	(B) as provided in Subsection 78B-3-416(3)(e)(i), the claimant and the respondent
123	stipulated that no useful purpose would be served by convening a pre-litigation panel;
124	(C) the claimant and the respondent agreed to arbitration;
125	(D) the panel found, as provided in Subsection 78B-3-418(2), that the claim against the
126	respondent has merit; and
127	(E) the panel found, as provided in Subsection 78B-3-418(2), that the claim against the
128	respondent has merit, but the conduct complained of did not result in harm to the claimant;
129	(iv) if an affidavit of merit was filed by the claimant, for each health care provider who
130	submitted an affidavit under Subsection (2)(b):
131	(A) the health care provider's license class and professional specialty; and
132	(B) whether the health care provider meets the requirements of Subsection
133	78B-3-423(3); and
134	(v) whether the claimant filed an action in court against the respondent.
135	(9) The division may require the following persons to submit the information to the
136	division necessary for the division to comply with Subsection (8):
137	(a) a claimant;
138	(b) a respondent;
139	(c) a health care provider who submits an affidavit under Subsection (2)(b); and
140	(d) a medical liability pre-litigation panel.
141	Section 2. Section <b>78B-3-426</b> is amended to read:
142	78B-3-426. Nonpatient cause of action.
143	(1) For purposes of this section, a nonpatient plaintiff does not include a patient, as
144	defined in Subsection 78B-3-403(23).
145	(2) This section does not apply to a healthcare malpractice action brought or seeking
146	recovery under Section 30-2-11, 78B-3-106, 78B-3-107, or 78B-3-502.
147	(3) To establish a malpractice action against a health care provider, a nonpatient
148	plaintiff shall be required to show that:
149	(a) the health care provider owes a duty to the nonpatient plaintiff;
150	[(a)] (b) the nonpatient plaintiff suffered [an] a foreseeable, physical injury;
151	[(b)] (c) the nonpatient plaintiff's injury was proximately caused by an act or omission

S.B. 223 02-22-18 2:24 PM

153

154

155

[(c)] (d) the health care provider's act or omission was conduct that manifests a knowing and reckless indifference toward, and a disregard of, the injury suffered by the nonpatient plaintiff.

Legislative Review Note Office of Legislative Research and General Counsel